

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS & INTERFERENCES

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| In re App. No.: | 09/449,021 |) | <u>PATENT APPLICATION</u> |
| | |) | |
| Filing Date: | November 24, 1999 |) | Art Unit: 2192 |
| | |) | |
| Inventors: | Emmelmann |) | Examiner: C. Kendall |
| | |) | |
| Title: | <i>Interactive Server Side</i> |) | |
| | <i>Components</i> |) | |

Customer No.: 8665

ERRATA SHEET

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF
filed 12-September-2011

Dear Sir,

Appellant's Reply Brief filed September 12, 2011, included several typographical and other errors that were inadvertently not corrected prior to submission. This Errata Sheet identifies these items.

ERRATA SHEET
APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF
filed 12-September-2011

Errata:

1. The Table Of Contents contained several errors, and a revised Table of Contents is attached to this Errata Sheet:
 - a. section III.B.5 of the Arguments section (re Claims dependent on claim 59) was omitted from the Table of Contents, and the remaining sub-sections were misnumbered;
 - b. the title for section II.D was incorrect;
 - c. various page number references were incorrect and/or missing;
 - d. "Claims Appendix" was removed from the Table of Contents since the pending claims were not required and not included with the Reply Brief;
2. The body of the Reply Brief also contained several errors:
 - a. page 4, first paragraph: the date should read 12/13/2010, not 2011;
 - b. page 6, first paragraph: the reference to section IV should be to the Petition for Reinclusion of Claims into Appeal, filed concurrently with the Reply Brief;
 - c. page 15, the title of section A should be "The Independent Claims" instead of "Independent Claims";
 - d. page 20, first paragraph: the reference to section S.46 should be to section I;
 - e. page 23, second paragraph: the words "Appellant's believe" should be replaced with "Appellant believes that";
 - f. page 25, first paragraph, the reference to section S.68 should be to section II.B;
 - g. in four places identified below, references to section II.C.III should be to section II.C.iii:
 - i. page 28, first line;

- ii. page 41, last full paragraph;
- iii. page 48, next-to-last full paragraph; and
- iv. page 49, first paragraph;
- h. page 32, first full paragraph: the word “not” should be added before “show”;
- i. page 33, last paragraph: the text “appellant notes that the this portion” should read “appellant notes that this portion;”
- j. page 37, third paragraph, first line, after “refers” add “to;” and in the second line, after “arguments” add “on”;
- k. page 42, first line: “understand” should be “understands”;
- l. page 45, fourth line from the bottom, the phrase “In is unclear how the examiner the proposed” should read “It is unclear how the examiner believes the proposed;”
- m. page 47, last paragraph: the words “not explicitly” should be replaced by “expressly not”.
- n. in numerous places, references to subsections of III.A are missing a period; e.g., III.A3.b should read III.A.3.b.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 September 2011

By: /Richard A. Nebb/
Richard A. Nebb
Reg. No. 33,540

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

3 Embarcadero Center, Suite 410

San Francisco, California 94111

Telephone: 415.705.6377

Facsimile: 415.705.6383

Email: rnebb@dergnoah.com

APPELLANT’S REPLY BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS (revised)

| | |
|--|----|
| STATUS OF CLAIMS..... | 1 |
| GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL..... | 2 |
| ARGUMENTS..... | 3 |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| II. THE CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE CITED COMBINATIONS | |
| A. THE EXAMINER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUSNESS | 6 |
| B. THE FAUSTINI PATENT ADDS LITTLE TO THE DISCUSSION OF PATENTABILITY..... | 8 |
| C. THE EXAMINER CONTINUES TO MISINTERPRET THE WEBWRITER ARTICLES..... | 9 |
| i. THERE IS NO CONNECTION FROM THE WEBWRITER PAGE GENERATOR TO THE WEBWRITER EDITOR | 10 |
| ii. THE WEB WRITER EDITOR DOES NOT PERMIT EDITING OF AN APPLICATION RUNNING DURING EDITING..... | 11 |
| iii. THE PREVIEW IN WEBWRITER LOOKS DIFFERENT AND DOES NOT FUNCTION DURING EDITING..... | 13 |
| D. THE APPEAL BRIEF AND PREVIOUS REPLY BRIEF REMAIN RELEVANT | 14 |
| III. DETAILED DISCUSSION OF CLAIMS | |
| A. The Independent Claims..... | 15 |
| 1. Claim 1 | 15 |
| 2. Claim 22..... | 21 |
| 3. Claim 26..... | 24 |
| 4. Claim 59..... | 27 |
| B. The Dependent Claims..... | 31 |
| 1. Claim 2..... | 31 |
| 2. Claim 23..... | 32 |
| 3. Claim 30 | 34 |
| 4. Claim 41-42 | 35 |
| 5. General discussion on claims dependent on claim 59..... | 36 |
| 6. Claim 60 | 36 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 7. Claim 61 | 37 |
| 8. Claim 63..... | 38 |
| 9. Claim 67..... | 38 |
| 10. Claim 68 | 39 |
| 11. Claim 69 | 39 |
| 12. Claim 72..... | 39 |
| 13. Claim 73..... | 40 |
| IV. THE EXAMINER’S REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENTS IS NOT CONVINCING..... | 41 |